



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/866,373	05/25/2001	Richard L. Schwartz	073612.0108	4418

  

31625	7590	07/25/2007
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P. PATENT DEPARTMENT 98 SAN JACINTO BLVD., SUITE 1500 AUSTIN, TX 78701-4039		

  

EXAMINER	
PHILLIPS, HASSAN A	

  

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2151	

  

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/25/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/866,373

Applicant(s)

SCHWARTZ ET AL.

Examiner

Hassan Phillips

Art Unit

2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-6,9-47,49-52 and 55-101 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-6,9-47,49-52 and 55-101 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/8/07.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is in response to communications filed May 8, 2007.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed May 8, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argued neither Parsons nor Kimura, whether alone or in combination, disclose, teach, suggest or make obvious a method comprising "receiving from the second user via the second communication device a reply for accepting the request selected by the second user during the mediated communication session from at least one response displayed on the second communication device, the at least one response displayed on the second communication device in response to receiving the request for implementing the interactive communication session," as recited in Claim 1. Examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant's assertions.

3. With regards to applicants remarks, as indicated in the previous action, the rejection of applicants claimed limitation "receiving from the second user via the second communication device a reply for accepting the request selected by the second user during the mediated communication session from at least one response displayed on the second communication device, the at least one response displayed on the second communication device in response to receiving the request for implementing the interactive communication session," as recited in Claim 1, is based on the combination of teachings disclosed in both Parsons and Kimura. In the previous action examiner

Art Unit: 2151

indicated Parsons discloses receiving from a presence system (112) a reply pre-selected by a user for accepting a request during a mediated communication session from at least one response stored at the presence system, (Parsons, pg. 4, par. 0038). Examiner acknowledged that while Parsons disclosed substantial features of applicant's claimed invention, Parsons failed to expressly disclose the presence system being a second user wherein, the second user selects the reply from at least one response displayed on a second communication device, the at least one response displayed on the second communication device in response to receiving the request for implementing the interactive communication session. Nevertheless, examiner provided the teachings of Kimura to make up for the deficiencies of Parsons. Kimura, being from a similar field of endeavor, expressly teaches a second user selecting a reply from at least one response displayed on a second communication device, the at least one response displayed on the second communication device in response to receiving a request for implementing an interactive communication session (col. 1, lines 55-67). Although the reply taught by Kimura is not for accepting the request, examiner maintains one of ordinary skill in the art would have it obvious to modify the teachings of Kimura to disclose the reply being for accepting the request at least where Kimura teaches the reply being a *particular adequate message* for allowing a first communication device to take an *adequate measure*, (Kimura, col. 4, lines 48-54). Furthermore, as previously indicated, Parsons discloses a reply for accepting a request. Examiner maintains it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Parsons with Kimura to disclose the presence system as a second user wherein, the

second user selects the reply from at least one response displayed on a second communication device, the at least one response displayed on the second communication device in response to receiving the request for implementing the interactive communication session, to advantageously give a second user the option of manually implementing a preferred method of contact when the second user accepts a request for implementing an interactive communication session with the first user, (Parsons, pg. 4, par. 0038, Kimura, col. 1, lines 55-67). Such implementation would function similar to how Parsons teaches the presence system implementing a preferred method of contact when the presence system accepts a request for implementing an interactive communication session with the first user, (Parsons, pg. 4, par. 0038).

4. Furthermore, it is also the examiner's position that applicant has not yet submitted claims drawn to limitations, which define the operation and apparatus of applicant's disclosed invention in a manner that distinguishes over the prior art. Failure for applicant to significantly narrow definition/scope of the claims implies the applicant intends broad interpretation be given to the claims. The examiner has interpreted the claims with scope parallel to the applicant in the response and reiterated the need for applicant to define the claimed invention more clearly and distinctly. Accordingly the references supplied by the examiner in the previous office action covers the claimed limitations. The rejections are thus sustained. Applicant is requested to review the prior art of record for further consideration.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 3-6, 33-36, 41-47, 49-52, 67, 69-82, 87-101, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parsons et al. (hereinafter Parsons), U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0085701 in view of Kimura U.S. Patent 5,758,280, (see Applicant's IDS).

7. In considering claims 1, 47, and 93, Parsons teaches a method, program product, and apparatus capable of: facilitating a mediated communication session between a first communication device (104, 110, 116, 118, 122) directly interfaced by a first user and a second communication (104, 110, 116, 118, 122) device directly interfaced by a second user, wherein facilitating the mediated communication session includes receiving from the first communication device a request for implementing an interactive communication session with the second user, (pg. 4, par.'s 0039-0041); receiving from a presence system (112) a reply pre-selected by the user for accepting the request during the mediated communication session from at least one response stored at the presence system, (pg. 4, par. 0038); and in response to receiving the reply for accepting the request, implementing the interactive communication session between

Art Unit: 2151

the first communication device and a third communication device (104, 110, 116, 118, 122) directly interfaced by the second user, the interactive communication session enabling the second user to communicate with the first user via the third communication device, (pg. 8, par.'s 0087, 0088).

Although the teachings of Parsons show substantial features of the claimed invention, they fail to expressly disclose: the second user selecting the reply from at least one response displayed on the second communication device, the at least one response displayed on the second communication device in response to receiving the request for implementing the interactive communication session.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor, Kimura teaches a second user selecting a reply from at least one response displayed on a second communication device, the at least one response displayed on the second communication device in response to receiving a request for implementing an interactive communication session (col. 1, lines 55-67).

Thus, given the teachings of Kimura it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Parsons to show the second user selecting the reply from at least one response displayed on the second communication device, the at least one response displayed on the second communication device in response to receiving the request for implementing the interactive communication session. This would have advantageously given the second user the option of manually implementing a preferred method of contact when the second user accepts a request for implementing an interactive communication session with the first user, similar to how

the presence system implements a preferred method of contact when the presence system accepts a request for implementing an interactive communication session with the first user, (Parsons, pg. 4, par. 0038, Kimura, col. 1, lines 55-67).

8. In considering claims 3, 34, 49, 80, and 100, Parsons discloses receiving the request for implementing from the first communication device including receiving the request for implementing from a wireless communication device (118) capable of transmitting and receiving data packets, (Fig. 1, pg. 3, par. 0029).

9. In considering claims 4, 35, 50, 81, and 101, Parsons teaches receiving the reply for accepting the request from a wireless communication device (118) capable of transmitting and receiving data packets, (Fig. 1, pg. 3, par. 0029).

10. In considering claims 5, and 51, Parsons teaches facilitating a voice- based mediated communication session and implementing an interactive communication session including implementing a text-based interactive communication session, (pg. 4, par.'s 0039-0041).

11. In considering claims 6, 36, 52, and 82, the combined teachings of Parsons and Kimura provide a means for facilitating a text-based mediated communication session between a mediation system and the first communication device, (Kimura, col. 1, lines 55-67, Parsons, pg. 4, par. 0041); and facilitating voice- based communication



Art Unit: 2151

between the mediation system and the second communication device, (Parsons, pg. 4, par.'s 0039, 0040, Kimura, col. 1, lines 55-67). One of ordinary skill in the art would combine the teachings of Parsons with Kimura for the same reasons indicated in claims 1, 47, and 93.

12. In considering claims 33, and 79, Parsons teaches a method, and data processor program product, comprising: facilitating a voice-based mediated communication session between a first communication device (104, 110, 116, 118, 122) directly interfaced by a first user and a second communication (104, 110, 116, 118, 122) device directly interfaced by a second user, wherein facilitating the mediated communication session includes receiving from the first communication device a request for implementing a text-based interactive communication session with the second user, (pg. 4, par. 0041); receiving from a presence system (112) a reply pre-selected by the user for accepting the request during the mediated communication session from at least one response stored at the presence system, (pg. 4, par. 0038); implementing the text-based interactive communication session between the first communication device and a third communication device (104, 110, 116, 118, 122) directly interfaced by the second user in response to receiving the reply for accepting the request, the interactive communication session enabling the second user to communicate with the first user via the third communication device, (pg. 4, par. 0041); and managing the interactive communications session between the first communication

Art Unit: 2151

device and the third communication device after performing an operation for implementing the interactive communication session, (pg. 4, par.'s 0041-0044).

Although the teachings of Parsons show substantial features of the claimed invention, they fail to expressly disclose: the second user selecting the reply from at least one response displayed on the second communication device, the at least one response displayed on the second communication device in response to receiving the request for implementing the interactive communication session.

Nevertheless, in a similar field of endeavor, Kimura teaches a second user selecting a reply from at least one response displayed on a second communication device, the at least one response displayed on the second communication device in response to receiving a request for implementing an interactive communication session (col. 1, lines 55-67).

Thus, given the teachings of Kimura it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Parsons to show the second user selecting the reply from at least one response displayed on the second communication device, the at least one response displayed on the second communication device in response to receiving the request for implementing the interactive communication session. This would have advantageously given the second user the option of manually implementing a preferred method of contact when the second user accepts a request for implementing an interactive communication session with the first user, similar to how the presence system implements a preferred method of contact when the presence

system accepts a request for implementing an interactive communication session with the first user, (Parsons, pg. 4, par. 0038, Kimura, col. 1, lines 55-67).

13. In considering claims 41, 69, and 87, Parsons teaches displaying a textual dialog interface on a visual display of the third communication device, (pg. 4, par. 0041); and displaying a dialog response on a visual display of the first communication device, (pg. 4, par. 0041).

14. In considering claim 42, 70, and 88, Parsons teaches displaying a text entry field for enabling a text message to be composed and a dialog thread field for displaying textual dialog between the first and third communication devices, (pg. 4, par. 0041).

15. In considering claim 43, 71, and 89, Kimura teaches the dialog response including displaying a predefined dialog response, (col. 1, lines 55-67). One of ordinary skill in the art would combine the teachings of Kimura with Parsons for reasons previously indicated in considering claims 33, 47, and 79.

16. In considering claims 44, and 90, the combined teachings of Parsons and Kimura provide a means for displaying the predefined dialog response including selecting the predefined dialog response from a group of predefined dialog responses including a dialog response for responding in the affirmative manner to a textual message, a dialog response for responding in a negative manner to a textual message,

Art Unit: 2151

and a dialog response for responding that a response to the textual message will be momentarily delayed, (Kimura, col. 1, lines 55-67; Parsons, pg. 4, par. 0041). One of ordinary skill in the art would combine the teachings of Kimura with Parsons for reasons previously indicated in considering claims 33 and 79.

17. In considering claim 45, 76, and 91, Kimura teaches displaying the contextual response message including analyzing at least a portion of the textual message, (col. 1, lines 55-67). One of ordinary skill in the art would combine the teachings of Kimura with Parsons for reasons previously indicated in considering claims 33, 47, and 79.

18. In considering claim 46, 78, and 92, the combined teachings of Parsons and Kimura provide a means for displaying a response for initiating a transfer from the interactive communication session to a telephonic communication session, (Kimura, col. 1, lines 55-67; Parsons, pg. 4, par. 0041). One of ordinary skill in the art would combine the teachings of Kimura with Parsons for reasons previously indicated in considering claims 33, 47, and 79.

19. In considering claim 67, Parsons teaches managing the interactive communication session between the first communication device and the third communication device after performing an operation for implementing the interactive communication session, (pg. 4, par. 0041-0044).

20. In considering claim 72, the combined teachings of Parsons and Kimura provide a means for displaying a dialog response for responding in the affirmative manner to a textual message (Kimura, col. 1, lines 55-67; Parsons, pg. 4, par. 0041). One of ordinary skill in the art would combine the teachings of Kimura with Parsons for reasons previously indicated in considering claim 47.

21. In considering claim 73, Kimura teaches displaying a dialog response for responding in a negative manner to a textual message, (col. 1, lines 55-67). One of ordinary skill in the art would combine the teachings of Kimura with Parsons for reasons previously indicated in considering claim 47.

22. In considering claim 74, the combined teachings of Parsons and Kimura provide a means for displaying a dialog response for responding that a response to the textual message will be momentarily delayed, (Kimura, col. 1, lines 55-67; Parsons, pg. 4, par. 0041). One of ordinary skill in the art would combine the teachings of Kimura with Parsons for reasons previously indicated in considering claim 47.

23. In considering claim 75, Kimura teaches displaying a contextual response message associated with a context of a textual message, (col. 1, lines 55-67). One of ordinary skill in the art would combine the teachings of Kimura with Parsons for reasons previously indicated in considering claim 47.

24. In considering claim 77, the combined teachings of Parsons and Kimura provide a means for displaying an action-based response for initiating a system-implemented action, (Kimura, col. 1, lines 55-67; Parsons, pg. 4, par. 0041). One of ordinary skill in the art would combine the teachings of Kimura with Parsons for reasons previously indicated in considering claim 47.

25. In considering claims 94-97, Parsons teaches facilitating the mediated communication session, (pg. 4, par. 0039-0041); receiving the reply for accepting the request, (pg. 4, par. 0039-0041); and implementing the interactive communication session, (pg. 4, par. 0039-0041).

26. In considering claim 98, Parsons teaches managing the interactive communication session, (pg. 4, par. 0041-0044).

27. In considering claim 99, Parsons teaches receiving the request for implementing including receiving the request for implementing from the first communication device, (pg. 4, par.'s 0039-0041); and the combined teachings of Parsons and Kimura provide a means for receiving the reply for accepting the request including receiving the reply for accepting the request from the second communication device, (Kimura, col. 1, lines 55-67; Parsons, pg. 4, par. 0041). One of ordinary skill in the art would combine the teachings of Kimura with Parsons for reasons previously indicated in considering claims 1, 33, 47, and 79.

28. Claims 9-32, 37-40, 55-66, 68, 83-86, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parsons in view of Kimura and further in view of Kay et al. (hereinafter Kay), U.S. Patent 6,430,602.

29. In considering claims 9, 37, 55, and 83, although the combined teachings of Parsons and Kimura disclose substantial features of the claimed invention, they fail to expressly disclose: preparing log-in information for the interactive communication session, transmitting the log-in information to the second communication device, receiving the log-in information from the third communication device, and authenticating the log-in information.

Nevertheless, log-in information was well known in the art. Parsons exemplifies this where Parsons teaches logging into the presence system, (pg. 6, par. 0052). Further, in analogous teachings Kay teaches preparing log-in information for an interactive communication session, (co1.10, lines 8-57); transmitting the log-in information to a second communication device, (co1.10, lines 8-57); receiving the log-in information from a third communication device, (co1.10, lines 8-57); and authenticating the log-in information, (co1.10, lines 8-57).

Thus, given the teachings of Kay, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings Parsons to disclose preparing log-in information for the interactive communication session, transmitting the log-in information to the second communication device, receiving the log-in information from the third

Art Unit: 2151

communication device, and authenticating the log-in information. This would have advantageously provided some measure of security for the communication session, (col. 10, lines 8-14).

30. In considering claims 10 and 56, Parsons teaches generating a passcode, (pg. 6, par. 0052).

31. In considering claims 11 and 57, Kay teaches generating a chronologically referenced passcode, (col.10, lines 8-57); and authenticating the log-in information including determining an elapsed period of time from when the chronologically referenced passcode was generated and verifying that the elapsed period of time is less than a prescribed validation period for which the passcode is valid, (col.10, lines 8-57). One of ordinary skill in the art would combine the teachings of Kay with Parsons for reasons previously indicated in considering claims 9 and 55.

32. In considering claims 12, 38, 58, and 84, it is implicit in the teachings of Kay that a time-stamped passcode is generated, (col.10, lines 8-57). One of ordinary skill in the art would combine the teachings of Kay with Parsons for reasons previously indicated in considering claims 9, 37, 55, and 83.

33. In considering claims 13 and 59, Parsons teaches receiving the request for implementing including receiving the request for implementing from the first



Art Unit: 2151

communication device wherein the first communication device is a mediated party communication device, (pg. 4, par.'s 0039-0041); Kay teaches preparing the log-in information including receiving a mediated party-specified passcode from the first communication device, (col.10, lines 8-57). One of ordinary skill in the art would combine the teachings of Kay with Parsons for reasons previously indicated in considering claims 9 and 55.

34. In considering claims 14 and 60, Parsons teaches receiving the request for implementing including receiving the request for implementing from the first communication device wherein the first communication device is a mediated subscriber communication device, (pg. 4, par.'s 0039-0041); Kay teaches preparing the log-in information including receiving a mediated subscriber-specified passcode from the first communication device, (col.10, lines 8-57). One of ordinary skill in the art would combine the teachings of Kay with Parsons for reasons previously indicated in considering claims 9 and 55.

35. In considering claims 15 and 61, Kay teaches generating an interactive communication session log-in address, (col.10, lines 8-57). One of ordinary skill in the art would combine the teachings of Kay with Parsons for reasons previously indicated in considering claims 9 and 55.

36. In considering claims 16, 39, 62, and 85, Kay teaches generating a unique communication network log-in address, (col.10, lines 8-57). One of ordinary skill in the art would combine the teachings of Kay with Parsons for reasons previously indicated in considering claims 9, 37, 55, and 83.

37. In considering claims 17, 40, 63, and 86, Kay teaches generating a mediation subscriber specific Internet website address, (col.10, lines 8-57). One of ordinary skill in the art would combine the teachings of Kay with Parsons for reasons previously indicated in considering claims 9, 37, 55, and 83.

38. In considering claims 18 and 64, Kay teaches transmitting a text session authorization notification to an interactive communication session system after authenticating the log-in information, (col.10, lines 8-57). One of ordinary skill in the art would combine the teachings of Kay with Parsons for reasons previously indicated in considering claims 9 and 55.

39. In considering claims 19 and 65, Kay teaches invalidating the passcode after a prescribed validation period elapses, (col.10, lines 8-57). One of ordinary skill in the art would combine the teachings of Kay with Parsons for reasons previously indicated in considering claims 9 and 55.

40. In considering claims 20 and 66, Kay teaches invalidating the passcode after implementing the interactive communication session, (col. 10, lines 8-57). One of ordinary skill in the art would combine the teachings of Kay with Parsons for reasons previously indicated in considering claims 9 and 55.

41. In considering claim 21, Parsons teaches managing the interactive communication session between the first communication device and the third communication device after performing an operation for implementing the interactive communication session, (pg. 4, par. 0041-0044).

42. In considering claims 22 and 68, although Parsons shows substantial features of the claimed invention, Parsons fails to expressly disclose: receiving a communication session authorization notification.

Nevertheless, Kay teaches: authorized users receiving a notification in response to another authorized user logging into a network for the purpose of implementing an interactive communication session, (col. 1, lines 43-58). Furthermore, as indicated by Kay, receiving notifications for the purpose of implementing an interactive communication session was well known in the art at the time of the present invention.

Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Parsons with Kay to show receiving an interactive communication session authorization notification in response to implementing the interactive communication session. This would have provided a secure means for implementing an

Art Unit: 2151

interactive communication session by letting the user know that the user is authorized and ready to begin a communication session. This also would have assured the user that the communication session was safe from access by unauthorized users, (Kay, co1.10, lines 8-57).

43. In considering claim 23, Parsons teaches displaying a textual dialog interface on a visual display of the third communication device, (pg. 4, par. 0041); and displaying a dialog response on a visual display of the first communication device, (pg. 4, par. 0041).

44. In considering claim 24, Parsons teaches displaying a text entry field for enabling a text message to be composed and a dialog thread field for displaying textual dialog between the first and third communication devices, (pg. 4, par. 0041).

45. In considering claim 25, Kimura teaches the dialog response including displaying a predefined dialog response, (col. 1, lines 55-67). One of ordinary skill in the art would combine the teachings of Kimura with Parsons for reasons previously indicated in considering claim 1.

46. In considering claim 26, the combined teachings of Parsons and Kimura provide a means for displaying a dialog response for responding in the affirmative manner to a textual message (Kimura, col. 1, lines 55-67; Parsons, pg. 4, par. 0041).

Art Unit: 2151

One of ordinary skill in the art would combine the teachings of Kimura with Parsons for reasons previously indicated in considering claim 1.

47. In considering claim 27, Kimura teaches displaying a dialog response for responding in a negative manner to a textual message, (col. 1, lines 55-67). One of ordinary skill in the art would combine the teachings of Kimura with Parsons for reasons previously indicated in considering claim 1.

48. In considering claim 28, the combined teachings of Parsons and Kimura provide a means for displaying a dialog response for responding that a response to the textual message will be momentarily delayed, (Kimura, col. 1, lines 55-67; Parsons, pg. 4, par. 0041). One of ordinary skill in the art would combine the teachings of Kimura with Parsons for reasons previously indicated in considering claim 1.

49. In considering claim 29, Kimura teaches displaying a contextual response message associated with a context of a textual message, (col. 1, lines 55-67). One of ordinary skill in the art would combine the teachings of Kimura with Parsons for reasons previously indicated in considering claim 1.

50. In considering claim 30, Kimura teaches displaying the contextual response message including analyzing at least a portion of the textual message, (col. 1, lines 55-

Art Unit: 2151

67). One of ordinary skill in the art would combine the teachings of Kimura with Parsons for reasons previously indicated in considering claim 1.

51. In considering claim 31, the combined teachings of Parsons and Kimura provide a means for displaying an action-based response for initiating a system-implemented action, (Kimura, col. 1, lines 55-67; Parsons, pg. 4, par. 0041). One of ordinary skill in the art would combine the teachings of Kimura with Parsons for reasons previously indicated in considering claim 1.

52. In considering claim 32, the combined teachings of Parsons and Kimura provide a means for displaying a response for initiating a transfer from the interactive communication session to a telephonic communication session, (Kimura, col. 1, lines 55-67; Parsons, pg. 4, par. 0041). One of ordinary skill in the art would combine the teachings of Kimura with Parsons for reasons previously indicated in considering claim 1.

***Conclusion***

**53. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

**54.** Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hassan Phillips whose telephone number is 571-272-3940. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8am-5pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Valencia Wallace can be reached on 571-272-3440. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2151

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/HP/  
7/17/07

*Valencia Montezelle*  
SPE ART UNIT 2151